



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/506,474	08/19/2005	Robert Farrer Gilmour	07EW-119688	8913
30764	7590	02/21/2007	EXAMINER	
SHEPPARD, MULLIN, RICHTER & HAMPTON LLP			JACKSON, BRANDON LEE	
333 SOUTH HOPE STREET			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
48TH FLOOR			3772	
LOS ANGELES, CA 90071-1448				
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS	02/21/2007		PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/506,474	GILMOUR, ROBERT FARRER
	Examiner Brandon Jackson	Art Unit 3772

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 August 2005.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-4,6-11, and 13- 14 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-4,6-11, and 13- 14 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 03 September 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1.) Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2.) Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3.) Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/3/2004

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Specification

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it contains claim phraseology, is not on a separate sheet, and "café" should be "chafe" in the last sentence. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Objections

Claim 3 is objected to because of the following informalities: the term "either" should be deleted from the first line. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 6 is objected to because of the following informalities: the terms "paragraphs" should be "claims" in line 4, and the phrase "the or each set" is unclear. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 13 is objected to because of the following informalities: the term "either" should be deleted from line 1 of the claim. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-4, 6, 7 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gilmour (U.S. Patent 6,155,998). Gilmour discloses a chafe (30) comprising a slot (37) therein, a stud (35), and a connection means (33) connecting the stud (35) and the slot (37). The connection means (33), slot (37), and stud (35) are formed of a unitary construction. The stud (35) has an enlarged head. A walker frame (1) has a at least one set of apertures (31), wherein each set has at least two apertures therein (fig. 1), formed to allow the stud (35) to pass through to be optionally held or released therefrom (fig. 1).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gilmour (U.S. Patent 6,155,998) in view of Plath (U.S. Patent 5,311,972). Gilmour substantially discloses the claimed invention; see claims 6 and 7 rejections above. Gilmour discloses a walker having a set of apertures (upper 31) and a slot (lower 31) corresponding to each aperture (upper 31). Gilmour fails to disclose that the aperture has a wider lower part and a narrower upper end so the stud can pass through the lower part and retained by the upper end. However, Plath teaches a stud (19) that passes through the lower part (32) and is secured by a narrower upper end (33). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the chafe to have lower apertures of the walker frame having the Plath design, to secure the chafe to the frame because it holds the chafe in place so it does not move during ambulation, resulting in movement of the foot within the walker.

Claims 11 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gilmour (U.S. Patent 6,155,998) and Plath (U.S. Patent 5,311,972) in view of Coy (U.S. Patent 5,836,626). Gilmour/Plath substantially disclose the claimed invention, see claim 6-8 and 9-10 rejections above; Gilmour/Plath fails to disclose a walker having a

Art Unit: 3772

slot wherein the upper edge is a saw tooth pattern that can retain the stud head. The saw tooth pattern accomplished no stated problem and provides no specified advantage; therefore, it is a mere design consideration. Coy teaches a slot (22) with an upper edge (21) having a saw toothed pattern. It would have been obvious to modify the Gilmour/Plath walker to include a slot (lower 31) of Gilmour/Plath in a saw toothed pattern as taught by Coy because is an effective way to quickly secure a device that fits between the notches of the saw toothed pattern.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Haviland (U.S. Patent 1,947,773), (Mechem et al. (U.S. Patent 4,993,127), Fish et al. (U.S. Patent 5,220,816), Hines et al. (U.S. Patent 5,716,336), Gilmour (U.S. Patent 6,394,117), Iglesias et al. (U.S. Patent D473,654), Bucher et al. (U.S. Patent 6,872,053).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brandon Jackson whose telephone number is (571)272-3414. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patricia Bianco can be reached on (571)272-4940. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Brandon Jackson
Examiner
Art Unit 3772

BLJ

Patricia Bianco
PATRICIA BIANCO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700

2/16/07